ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ನಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದರೇ? ಅದನ್ನು ತಾವು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ? ಇದು ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಮನಗಂಡು ನಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಭಾಗಗಳನ್ನು ವರದಿಯಿಂದ ಹೊಡೆದುಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಕ್ರಮ ಸರಿಯೇ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He says that he is not attacking my ruling and still he is saying all this. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿವ್ವರು, ನೂಚನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು, ಅದನ್ನು ಆಬೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಅವರು ಆಗ ವಿರೋಧಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಿಸೀಡೆಂಟ್ ತುಂಬಾ ಉಂಟು, ನಾನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಡಿಬೇಟ್ ಮುಗಿದನಂತರ ಹೌಸ್ ಆಡ್ಜರ್ನ್ ಆದನಂತರ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪಂಜ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯೇ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಸರಿ, ನಾನು ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಇತರ ಶಾಸನಸಭೆಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಏನಾದರೂ ಪ್ರಿಸೀಡೆಂಟ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಳಿ. ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲದೆ ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಏನು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ?

10-30 A.M.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—You have just read the letter written by the concerned Minister. The Hon'ble Speaker has bestowed his thought on the matter as to whether it has to be expunged or not or what action has to be taken. I have some doubts in mind. I just want to know what exactly is the stand that should be taken by the Chair to decide when a Member makes an allegation, whether they are facts, whether the statement made by a particular Member is supported by facts or whether it is only a baseless allegation. If you can kindly give me two or three minutes after the Tea interval, I will explain.

Mr. SPEAKER.—All right. The House will now rise to meet again half-an-hour later.

The House adjourned at Thirty-two Minutes past Ten of the Clock and reassembled at Five Minutes past Eleven of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Member's representation.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ಪ್ಯಾಮೀ, ರೂಲ್ಸು ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರು 289ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಯಾವ ಆಲಿಗೇಷನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಪರ್ಮಿಷನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ನಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ತಿಂಗಳಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕೇಳಬಹುದೇ? ತಾವು ಆಗ ಇದ್ದಿರಿ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is he sure that I was present?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—That is my feeling.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would ask him to verify and then tell me.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸ್ಯಾಟಿಸ್‌ಫೈ ಆಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ನಾನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೇಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೇದು ಎಂದು ತೋರುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He wanted a chance to explain. I am giving a chance because I do not want anybody to have a feeling that any representation has been shut-out. Otherwise, I have delivered the Ruling. Is he questioning the Ruling or does he want any clarification ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not think that I should ask anybody before I give a ruling. If I have asked anybody, it is more out of desire to satisfy myself that I have not done anything without giving an opportunity.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದ ಕೆಲವು ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಳ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He knows Rule 289. Does he make any allegations ? If he has made allegations, did he comply with rule 289 ? I have not mentioned as to whose proceedings as to be expunged.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Though the Rule was there, for the past seven years, several allegations were made against several officers, but no Speaker, no Minister came forward with a plea that such and such a Member on such and such a date, has made personal allegations and they must be expunged. If you can kindly permit me, may I bring one instance to your kind notice ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does he want me to understand that Rule 289 is no longer in operation, or because it has not been followed in the past by somebody he is also entitled not to follow it ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The concerned Minister was here. Instead of his telling that I made complaints, he could have requested the Deputy Speaker, who was in the Chair, to call me to order and could have asked me not to make such statements.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Suppose they don't do it.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Even without coming before the Hon'ble Speaker, how can he say that such an allegation was made and that he investigated into the matter and the allegations are baseless ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let him justify his conduct.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I submit to the Chair, whose duty is that ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is the duty of every Member to comply with the rules.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I have got every information as to what allegation I have made. If an enquiry is instituted, I am prepared to face the consequences.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let him do so, if he likes, but not on the floor of the House.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—If we do not make the Government understand what is going on, why is it that we are here ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rules are there for making it known to the Government.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—If it is defamatory, suppose the officer is inefficient, suppose the officer is punished.....is it not my duty?

Mr SPEAKER.—That is a supposition.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I say there is a record in the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He made an allegation against a lady.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Yes, there is an investigation going on by the Government of India police.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the investigation over?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I do not know.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then how dares he to make it? Making allegations against ladies!

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—A person who is placed highly in position, a person who is holding very high place, who is supposed to protect law and order—suppose the family members of that person behave like that, what can be done? what is the way open to any member?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Should I tell him what he should do? I do not wish that members should get into complications. If he wants, let him go outside and say what he wants, I am trying to protect the Members.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Government is not in a position to know all that is happening in the country. It is the duty of the Members of this House to make them open their eyes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is it that he is telling me?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I am saying that even the concerned Mininister has not taken the trouble to investigate.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does he want me to reverse my ruling? I am not going to do it.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Have I no right to appeal to the Chair, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER:—He can do it on another occasion. He is making matter wrose for himself—not for me.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Before you took a decision regarding expunging this, an opportunity ought to have been given to me to explain my position, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have to inform the House that I did send for the Member to acquaint him with this so that he might not be taken by surprise. I did not want to tell all these things on the floor of the House. If he repeats what I wish to expunge, that also will be expunged.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I am not repeating it when a member of the family of an officer does it and supposing an officer is corrupt...

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have already said what procedure has to be adopted under such circumstances. Let him put it in writing and give it to the Government. Let him not take protection under the shelter of the House.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Then why should we think of vigilance committees and so on. Sir, the rule says: 'words' not sentences. If the Speaker is of the opinion that any word or words have been used in a debate which is defamatory or indecent...Sir, you have not made me understand what word or words were defamatory or what word is indecent and which word is unparliamentary. I am in the dark because you do not say which word is unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He is rolling a dozen things into one. Under what parliamentary practice should I call him and explain and convince him before I expunge a position which is impossible to accept? It is beyond imagination. Am I to explain to him?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Out of these 100 or 1,000 words mentioned, which word is defamatory?

Mr. SPEAKER.—If he goes on reading the proceedings and if he sees the asterisk, he will understand that it is omitted.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, I obey and I bow my head to the Chair. One or the other day it becomes very difficult for this House to function if it is not able to make the executive understand what is going on outside. In other State legislatures, the High Court Judges are summoned before the bar of legislature to explain.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, it appears that Rule 289 has led to some confusion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no confusion in my mind.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I do not say there is confusion in your mind. There is confusion in our mind. The usual practice or convention or even the law as it stands today is that whatever has been said on the floor of this House, the Member concerned or the whole House as such is exempt from criminal liability. This is the basic principle so far as any legislature is concerned. That is why this rule is provided. Here this Rule 289 is curtailing that right which is vested in this body. Sir, you have suggested to me on several occasions that the rules have got to be framed so as to suit the purpose and lawful functioning of this House. I should like to suggest that this is asterisk restriction that is placed upon our independence, our freedom of speech and expression. That is curtalied by this rule, and it ought to be removed, because I tell you a practical difficulty in this: in the whole country, even the highest persons occupying the highest position in our contry, have said that the whole administration from the centre at Delhi down to the village panchayet has become corrupt. They have admitted it. That is the reason why the committee was appointed. They have made suggestions and all these things are going on at the Centre and these things are now percolating to the States also. When the whole thing has become corrupt.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—If he criticises the Government, I never say anything. Government is here to defend itself. But the point is the member has spoken about a lady; do members support it? Suppose that lady happens to be the wife of an officer—does he support him?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The difficulty which we are facing is, is it ever possible for any member to comply with this rule ?

According to rule 289 :

> " No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker and also to the Minister concerned....."

When we have to make allegations against a number of people, is it possible for any member to give previous intimation to you and also to the Minister concerned and then it is up to the Minister to investigate into the matter for the purpose of reply. The reason given is to enable the Minister to call for the records and investigate into the matter. As to why this provision is made is clear from the subsequent sentence. "... so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of reply". Not for improving the administration ; we are not concerned with that. Whatever we may say, I do not think the Minister concerned is going to set right matters.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the point ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Why is the provision of notice given ? The intention appears to be to enable the Minister to reply to the allegation ; that is the thing that is covered by the rule. When a serious allegation is made, does he feel it necessary to reply ; why again an opportunity should be given to him after sleeping over the matter for so many days. I do not challenge him ; but is it proper on the part of the Minister concerned to sleep over the matter all these days and then write to you to get those remarks expunged. This rule must be interpreted in the spirit which is pervading everywhere that we have got a right to criticise but that criticism should not be centered, according to the previous ruling of the Chair, by mentioning the names. We can criticise the working of a department, etc. and we can mention the officers in their official capacity, but we cannot mention their names because they are not here to defend themselves In the Parliament recently some allegations were made against Mr. Malaviya and his Personal Assistant about bribery, etc., in relation to some firm called Shirajuddin Company. If this rule is to be interpreted in the sense in which it is sought to be made, then the whole proceedings relating to the case of Shirajuddin firm may have been expunged. We are making the criticism only with the view that they may improve. We bring the thing to the notice of the House not with the view that our names should come in the papers. We are only pointing out the defects so that they may improve. So far as the interpretation of the rule is concerned, the difficulty is there and I think, while framing the new rules, it is to be borne in mind that our right of expression should in no way be curtailed so as to gag our mouths.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಈಗ ತಾವು ಏನೊಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಅದು ಕೆಲವು ಮೂಲಭೂತವಾದ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದನೆಯದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾರೇ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಲೀ ಏನಾದರೂ ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳನ್ನು

ಮಾಡಬಹುದೇ ಅಥವಾ ಅವರ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದೇ ಬೇಡವೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದು. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಮತ್ತು ಅಂತಹವರ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಹೇಳಬಾರದು, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಮೊದಲೇ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಮೊದಲೇ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾರೂ ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ನಿನ 289 ಅಥವಾ 315 ನೆಯ ರೂಲ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ತಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅದು ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಮಾರ್ಗದಿಂದ ಕೆತ್ತು ಕೊಂಡಂತೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪಂಜ್ ಮಾಡುವ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾದ ಒಂದು ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಈಗ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಾ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಇಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ಸ್‌ನಿಂದ ಕೆಲವು ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಅದು ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡ ಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ಈಗ 2-3 ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದ ಏನು ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ಸ್ ಇದೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಕೆಲವು ಅಂಶ ಗಳನ್ನು ತಾವು ತೆಗೆಯಲೇ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದರೆ ನನ್ನ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಯಾವ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕೋ ಅವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಬೇಕು. ಹಿಂದೆ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪಂಜ್ ಆದುದು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಂತೆ ಕಾಣಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಎಲ್ಲಿತ್ತು? ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ರೂಲ್ ತೋರಿಸಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಹಾಗೆ ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದರೂ ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಅದು ಬೇರೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ನ್ಯಾಂಕ್ಶನ್ ಉಳಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will just take a few minutes to clarify the point raised by Sri V. S. Patil. He mentioned the case of Sri Malaviya. The Hon'ble Minister was there at that time. If an allegation is made against one of the Ministers should he not intervene because he is there? Then Sri Patil raised a point about the intention. I do not know what he exactly means by it. The rule is very explicit. But is it the intention or the wording that counts? Whatever may be the intention underlying the rule in the matter of making any allegation against a person, nothing should be done which is in any way inconsistent with the rule.

11-30 P.M.

Even if the rule is not there, convention, the status the dignity and the responsibility of the House is to see that the immunity given is not abused by making all kinds of allegations against persons who are not able to defend themselves in the House. These are the various heads under which restrictions have been placed on every Legislature in every civilised country. These are rules which are binding on the House. That is why Sri Patil very ably suggested that it might be a case for modification. Even there, I am more than doubtful but this is a case for study and may be done at the time the committee is constituted. But I may say that there are cases where such action has been taken

(MR. SPEAKER)

even without the rules. That is because the status of the Assembly deserves it. The very purpose of the rules is found in Article 194, that is, subject to the rules for conduct of business, these are the privileges. So, if the rules are there, the privilege is not taken away. No one should feel that the privileges given to the Members are abused. These are the rules which have been there all along. Apart from the rules, there are also conventions which have been respected. So far as the power of the Speaker is concerned, it is not necessary for anybody to bring to his notice. Sri Gopala Gowda says that it is his duty to explain to the House. It may be his view. I am bound by the rules and not the opinion of Sri Gopala Gowda. If concurrence of the House is necessary I am the first person to come before the House. If the House says 'No', I do not mind. That is my duty. But if I am to exercise a discretion, it should be left to me. But this kind of criticism should not be levelled.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Before we start the debate, I would like to draw the attention of Government to a matter which has a direct bearing on the execution of the Sharavati power project. With your leave I wish to state that the Vikram industries, an industry situated in Bangalore, manufactures steel structures for Sharavathi. For the past one week, on account of labour strike, the factory has ceased to function. I would like to know from Government if by their incapacity to fulfil their obligations with reference to the supply of steel structures for Sharavati, would it not hinder the progress of the project. I would like to draw the attention of the Labour Minister as well as the Chief Minister to this problem.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—What does the Hon. Member want Government to do ?

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—I want them to solve the labour tangle.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—So far as Sharavati is concerned, we have made other arrangements.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am more than doubtful if such a matter can come up here for discussion in this manner. If conciliation fails, it is a justiciable matter to be adjudicated by the court. How can we discuss it here ?

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Even now it is not too late. Government can intervene in the matter.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—I know something about the case. Conciliation failed because the employer never appeared in the conciliation proceedings. The matter is before Government for reference to the Industrial Tribunal. Since yesterday the factory is under a lockout.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—I am only interested in getting the steel structures. If they fail, I will get it from somebody else. I do not know what has happened but I know where to get the materials.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS.—I do not know what exactly the Hon. Member wants. There is a dispute between the management and the workers. Conciliation has taken place. Conciliation has failed and the matter is before Government as to whether it should be referred for adjudication or not. Government will take an immediate decision in the matter. Of course, subsequently, I think on 5th March 1964, a section of the mill had been closed and some 64 workers had been removed or retrenched, as a result of which, there is a strike going on even now. Conciliation has been fixed for the 4th, that is, tomorrow because we wanted to make another attempt to settle the dispute amicably.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The Speaker had promised today to take the call attention notice regarding the statement of the Railway Minister about the deviation of the Hassan-Mangalore rail. The Chief Minister is also here.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA:—It was included in the plan.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Only about ten days back the Railway Minister came to Bangalore and he issued a statement to deviate the proposed Hassan-Mangalore line. I request the Chief Minister to take up this matter with the Government of India and make a statement in this House assuring the House that the proposed line will not be deviated.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—We have already done it.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.]

NON-OFFICIAL RESOLUTION

Re. **making recommendation to Government of India to solve border disputes on the basis of linguistic majority, Contiguity, Village as a unit, and wishes of the people.**

† Sri M. SRINIVASA NAIK (Mangalore-I).—Sir, I rise to oppose the Resolution moved by my friend Sri V. S. Patil. Sir, I should point out that it is only a game of politics and the people residing in those areas are not very particular to join Maharastra.

Sir, I speak for the Konkani speaking people in that area who have come from Goa 400 years back and settled in Karwar and other places.

(Interruption by Sri N. O. Samaji)

I catch the point of Sri Samaji but I am not speaking about Goans. Sir, Konkani speaking people migrated from Goa when the Portugese invaded Goa and they have settled in these places. We have always put our weight with the democratic forces of the country and tried to build this country. We have got our own culture. Though people may say, we have no script, our script is Kannada. We have a paper in Mangalore and the script is Kannada. We have a publication called Bharat Sevak Samaj and the script is written in Kannada. We have got our Konkani Samaj in Madras. We have an Association in Delhi and Bombay. Wherever we have settled, we have nurtured our own